



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,999	08/27/2003	Mark Stuart Day	CIS03-35(7193)	4356

7590 07/17/2008
Barry W. Chapin, Esq.
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C.
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, MA 01581

EXAMINER

LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/648,999	Applicant(s) DAY, MARK STUART	
	Examiner KENNY S. LIN	Art Unit 2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29, 31 and 32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 and 31-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-29 and 31-32 are presented for examination. Claim 30 is canceled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/21/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3, 7-8, 10, 14-17, 2-2, 24, 26-28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dreke et al (Dreke), US 6,463,471, in view of Mathis, US 2003/0083046.

5. Dreke and Mathis were cited in the previous office action.

6. As per claims 1, 8 and 15-16, Dreke taught the invention substantially as claimed including a computerized device comprising:

- a. At least one communication interface (clients, col.3, lines 23-28);
- b. A controller (col.3, lines 20-22, 32-36: IPSI); and
- c. An interconnection mechanism coupling the at least one communications interface and the controller (fig.1, col.3, lines 23-30);
- d. Wherein controller is configured to:
 - i. Receive, from the content subscriber, a subscription request for presence information, wherein the subscription request includes a subscription request for a current value of the presence information and a subscription request for changes in the current value of the presence information (abstract, col.4, lines 3-9, 44-48);
 - ii. Insert an address within a notification message in response to receiving the subscription request, the address relating to the presence information (abstract, col.4, lines 9-12); and
 - iii. Transmit the notification message to the content subscriber (col.4, lines 9-12), the address of the notification message allowing the content subscriber to subscribe to the presence information resulting in the content subscriber receiving a current value of the presence information and changes in the current value of the presence information from the computerized device (abstract, col.4, lines 19-48, col.5, lines 20-21).

7. Dreke did not specifically teach that the address is related to presence information *transmitted using a one-to-many transmission channel*. Mathis taught to insert a multicast address within a message wherein the address is related to the presence information and allow the content subscriber to subscribe to the presence information using a one-to-many transmission channel (pp. 0005-0006, 0012). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dreke and Mathis because Mathis' teaching of multicasting presence information to a plurality of devices enables Dreke's system to effectively update and distribute presence information about members of a contact list in a wireless network (see Mathis pp. 0004).

8. As per claims 17, 22 and 27-28, Dreke taught the invention substantially as claimed including a content subscriber comprising:

- a. At least one communications interface (col.3, lines 23-28);
- b. A controller (col.3, lines 20-28, 32-36); and
- c. An interconnection mechanism coupling the at least one communications interface and the controller (fig.1, col.3, lines 23-30);
- d. Wherein controller is configured to:
 - i. Transmit, via the at least one communications interface, a first subscription request for presence information to a computerized device (abstract, col.4, lines 3-9);
 - ii. Receive, via the at least one communications interface, in response to transmitting the subscription request, a notification message from the

computerized device, the notification message having an address relating to the presence information (col.4, lines 9-12);

- iii. Transmit, via the at least one communication interface, a second subscription request for the presence information, wherein the second subscription request includes a subscription request for a current value of the presence information and a subscription request for changes in the current value of the presence information; wherein transmission of the second subscription request results in receiving a current value of the presence information and changes in the current value of the presence information from the computerized device (abstract, col.4, lines 19-48, col.5, lines 20-21).

9. Dreke did not specifically teach that the address is related to presence information *transmitted using a one-to-many transmission channel*. Mathis taught to insert a multicast address within a message wherein the address is related to the presence information and allow the content subscriber to subscribe to the presence information using a one-to-many transmission channel (pp. 0005-0006, 0012, 0022-0023). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dreke and Mathis because Mathis' teaching of multicasting presence information to a plurality of devices enables Dreke's system to effectively update and distribute presence information about members of a contact list in a wireless network (see Mathis pp. 0004).

Art Unit: 2152

10. As per claims 3 and 10, Dreke and Mathis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 8. Mathis further taught the step of inserting comprises inserting a plurality of address within the notification message, each of the plurality of addresses relating to presence information transmitted using a corresponding one-to-many transmission channel (pp. 0012, 0021-0022).

11. As per claims 20 and 24, Dreke and Mathis taught the invention as claimed in claims 17 and 22. Mathis further taught the step of receiving comprises receiving a notification message from the computerized device, the notification message having a plurality of addresses, each of the plurality of addresses relating to presence information transmitted using a corresponding one-to-many transmission channel and further comprising selecting a one-to-many transmission channel for reception of the presence information (pp. 0012, 0021-0022).

12. As per claims 7 and 14, Dreke and Mathis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 8. Mathis further taught that:

- a. The step of inserting comprises inserting the address within the notification message in response to receiving the subscription request, the address relating to presence information transmitted using a multicast transmission channel (pp. 0005-0006, 0012, 0022-0023); and
- b. The step of transmitting comprises transmitting the notification message to the content subscriber, the address of the notification message allowing the content

subscriber to subscribe to the presence information using the multicast transmission channel (pp. 0012, 0022-0023).

13. As per claims 21 and 26, Dreke and Mathis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 17 and 22. Mathis further taught that:

- a. The step of receiving comprises receiving, in response to transmitting the subscription request, a notification message from the computerized device, the notification message having an address relating to presence information transmitted using a multicast transmission channel (pp. 0005-0006, 0012, 0022-0023); and
- b. The step of transmitting a second subscription request comprises transmitting the second subscription request for presence information using the multicast transmission channel (pp. 0012, 0022-0023).

14. Claims 2, 9, 18 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dreke and Mathis as applied to claims 1, 8, 17 and 22 above, and further in view of Costa-Requena et al (hereinafter Costa), US 2004/0098491.

15. Costa was cited in the previous office action.

16. As per claims 2 and 9, Dreke and Mathis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 8. Mathis further taught the step of inserting further comprises inserting an address

Art Unit: 2152

identifier within the notification message (pp. 0021). Dreke and Mathis did not specifically teach that the address identifier to indicate the availability of the address within the notification message. Costa taught to indicate the availability of the presence information and the address of the presence information (pp. 0028). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dreke, Mathis and Costa because Costa's teaching of indicating the availability of the address enables Dreke and Mathis' system to inform the subscriber whether the presence information is available.

17. As per claims 18 and 23, Dreke and Mathis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 17 and 22. Mathis further taught the step of receiving further comprises receiving an address identifier within the notification message (pp. 0005-0006, 0021) and:

- a. Examining the address identifier (pp. 0021);
- b. When identifying the address identifier in response to examining, utilizing the address to transmit the second subscription request for presence information using the one-to-many transmission channel (pp. 0022-0023).

18. Dreke and Mathis did not specifically teach that the address identifier to indicate the availability of the address within the notification message. Costa taught to indicate the availability of the presence information and the address of the presence information (pp. 0028). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dreke, Mathis and Costa because Costa's teaching of indicating the availability of the address enables Dreke and Mathis' system to inform the subscriber whether

Art Unit: 2152

the presence information is available at the directed address. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to save time and ignore the notification message when there exist an indication indicating that the presences information address inserted in the message is not available.

19. Claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dreke and Mathis as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Barbir et al (hereinafter Barbir), US 2003/0115283.

20. Barbir was cited in the previous office action.

21. As per claims 4 and 11, Dreke and Mathis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 8. Mathis further taught that the step of receiving comprises receiving a plurality of subscription requests for presence information from a plurality of subscribers and the step of transmitting comprises transmitting the notification message to a portion of the subscribers, the address of the notification message allowing the portion of the subscribers to subscribe to the presence information using the one-to-many transmission channel (abstract, pp. 0005-0006, 0012, 0021-0023). Dreke and Mathis did not specifically teach in detail to:

- a. Detect a size characteristic of the plurality of content subscribers;
- b. Compare the size characteristic to a threshold condition.

22. Barbir taught to redirect subscriber requests according to content server load and to detect a size characteristic of the plurality of content subscribers and compare the size characteristic to a threshold condition in determine the server load (abstract, pp. 0006-0007, 0010, 0013-0016, 0031). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dreke, Mathis and Barbir because Barbir's teaching of determining size characteristics of the content subscribers helps Dreke and Mathis system to determine server loads and efficiently redirect the incoming requests to prevent server overload.

23. Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dreke, Mathis and Barbir as applied to claims 5 and 11 above, and further in view of Bobde et al (hereinafter Bobde), US 2003/0217099.

24. Bobde was cited in previous office action.

25. As per claims 5 and 12, Dreke, Mathis and Barbir taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 4 and 11. Dreke, Mathis and Barbir did not specifically teach to transmit a nullify notification message to a content subscriber subscribed to the presence information using the one-to-many transmission channel, the nullify notification message having a one-to-one address relating to presence information transmitted using a one-to-one transmission channel; and receive a second subscription request from the content subscriber for presence information using the one-to-one transmission channel. Bobde taught to comprise: transmitting a nullify notification message to a content subscriber subscribed to the presence information using the

Art Unit: 2152

one-to-many transmission channel, the nullify notification message having a one-to-one address relating to presence information transmitted using a one-to-one transmission channel (pp. 0022, 0029-0030, 0040-0047); and receiving a second subscription request from the content subscriber for presence information using the one-to-one transmission channel (pp. 0044-0047). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dreke, Mathis, Barbir and Bobde because Bobde's teaching of using nullify message enables Dreke, Mathis, Barbir's system to indicate the presence information is empty.

26. Claims 6, 13, 19 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dreke and Mathis as applied to claims 1, 8, 17 and 22 above, and further in view of Kinnunen et al (Kinnunen), US 6,813,501.

27. Kinnunen was cited in the previous office action.

28. As per claims 6 and 13, Dreke and Mathis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 8. Dreke further taught to comprise subscribing to the one-to-many transmission channel for reception of the presence information (pp. 0022, 0029-0030). Dreke and Mathis did not specifically teach to receive an unsubscribe message from the content subscriber in response to transmitting the notification message, the unsubscribe message indicating unsubscription from a one-to-one transmission channel for reception of the presence information. Kinnunen taught to use unsubscribe message to indicate unsubscription (col.14, lines 23-37). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dreke, Mathis and Kinnunen because Kinnunen's teaching of using unsubscribing message enables the subscribers of Dreke and Mathis' system to terminate their subscription when they no longer desire the presence information by sending a unsubscribing message and hence manually terminate the communication between the subscribers and the controller.

29. As per claims 19 and 25, Dreke and Mathis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 17 and 22. Dreke further taught so subscribe to receive the presence information (col.5, lines 20-21). Dreke and Mathis did not specifically teach to transmit an unsubscribe message to the presence server in response to receiving the notification message, the unsubscribe message indicating unsubscription from a one-to-one transmission channel for reception of the presence information. Kinnunen taught to use unsubscribe message to indicate unsubscription (col.14, lines 23-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dreke, Mathis and Kinnunen because Kinnunen's teaching of using unsubscribing message enables the subscribers of Dreke and Mathis' system to terminate their subscription when they no longer desire the presence information by sending a unsubscribing message and hence manually terminate the communication between the subscribers and the controller.

30. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dreke, Mathis and Kinnunen as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Bobde et al, (hereinafter Bobde), US 2003/0217099, and Friedman, US 2004/0158608.

31. Friedman was cited in the previous office action.

32. As per claim 29, Dreke, Mathis and Kinnunen taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 6. Dreke, Mathis and Kinnunen did not specifically teach to track the number of content subscribers using one-to-one transmission channel and the number of content subscribers using one-to many transmission channel based on the number of unsubscribe message received; and balance distribution of presence information between the one-to-one transmission channel and the one-to-many transmission channel based on the number of content subscribers using each channel. Bobde taught to track the number of content subscribers using one-to-one transmission channel and the number of content subscribers using one-to-many transmission channel based on the number of subscribe messages receive (pp. 0029: list of addresses of subscribers). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dreke, Mathis, Kinnunen and Bobde because Bobde's teaching of tracking subscribers enables Dreke, Mathis and Kinnunen's system to identify the subscribers on subscribing the presence information using the multicast address. Dreke, Mathis, Kinnunen and Bobde did not specifically teach to manage balance distribution of presence information between the one-to-one transmission channel and the one-to-many transmission channel based on the number of content subscribers using each channel. Friedman taught to include a load balancer for the presence server to balance traffic between the presence server and the subscribers (pp. 0029-0031). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dreke, Mathis,

Kinnunen, Bobde and Friedman because Friedman's teaching of using a load balancer enables Dreke, Mathis, Kinnunen and Bobde's system to balance presence information and updated presence information to the users and properly handle traffic load (see Friedman pp. 0030).

33. Claims 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dreke and Mathis as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Hughes, US 6,122,372.

34. Hughes was cited in the previous office action.

35. As per claims 31 and 32, Dreke and Mathis taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 8. Dreke and Mathis did not specifically teach that each address within the notification message includes a tag indicating a particular communications protocol and wherein the content subscriber is configured to communicate according to the communications protocol identified by said tag such that multiple protocols are utilizable by a plurality of independently-implemented content subscribers. Hughes taught to use protocol tags within messages to indicate a particular communication protocol of the messages and wherein the content subscriber is configured to communicate according to the communications protocol identified by the tag such that multiple protocols are utilized by a plurality of independently-implemented content subscribers (col.9, lines 25-32, 35-36, 58-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dreke, Mathis and Hughes because Hughes' teaching of using protocol tags enables Dreke and Mathis' system to determine the specific protocol to sending the messages.

Response to Arguments

36. Applicant's arguments filed 9/11/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

37. In the remark, applicant argued (1) Dreke fails to teach subscribing and receiving the current value of the presence information and a change in the current value of the presence information (2) The combination of five references is not obvious in rejection claim 29.

38. Examiner traverse the argument:

As to point (1), Dreke's teaching is not limited to having peers to ping for the other's presence information. Dreke specifically disclosed in column 4, lines 44-48 that with an improved method, each peer can keep track of who is interested in the its presence information and notified all interested peers of the changes of the its presence information. Thus, the request for its presence information automatically included the request for the change of its presence information.

As to point (2), This argument was previous address. In response to applicant's argument that the examiner has combined an excessive number of references, reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. See *In re Gorman*, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Conclusion

39. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

40. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tue.-Fri. and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Kenny S Lin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2152
July 16, 2008